### *Existing Light and Glare*

There are several sources of light and glare on the project site: streetlights, vehicles, and impervious surfaces. These sources are mainly located along the eastern, northern, and western project site boundaries, as well as on Parcel 3 north of Kaiser Drive. The main hospital building produces minimal light sources at night because it is currently vacant.

The major lighting sources in the project vicinity include the residential uses to the north, west, and south of the site, and car headlights and streetlights associated with Kiely Boulevard, Kaiser Drive, and Pepper Tree Lane. The contribution of lighting due to car headlights in the project area is significant along Kiely Boulevard due to the high volume of vehicles that use that street. Sources of glare include daytime reflections off structures and vehicles traveling on the roadways surrounding the site, headlights on these same roadways at night and reflection from existing impervious surfaces.

## 4.1.3 REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

There are no federal, state, or local regulations that apply to the proposed project regarding aesthetics.

## 4.1.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### 4.1.4.1 Significance Criteria

The impact of the proposed project on aesthetics would be considered significant if it would exceed the following standards of significance, in accordance with Appendix G of the *2008 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines*:

- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or
- create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

### 4.1.4.2 Methodology

Project conditions were evaluated against the existing visual character of the project site in the context of existing uses, vegetation, and visual character. The potential impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings were evaluated in terms of massing, size, and type of land use. The proposed project's

potential to introduce substantial new lighting and/or create new sources of glare that could affect nearby existing uses also was evaluated in order to determine potential impacts to visual resources.

### *Visual Simulations*

As part of the aesthetic impact evaluation of the project, massing and visual simulations have been produced using computer modeling and rendering techniques. A photo-realistic simulation was prepared for viewpoint 1 since the proposed multi-family-unit building is prominent in this view, and the decision makers and interested parties would benefit in viewing architectural detail and color from this viewing point. Massing simulations were prepared for viewpoints 2, 3, and 4 to show the mass and bulk of the proposed buildings and how that would change the existing visual setting. These simulations do not show detailed architectural design or color, and are intended to assist in evaluating the bulk and mass for the proposed buildings. The simulations have been prepared to show the project site with and without landscaping. This provides a more realistic view of the site in the short term, as well as views of the site in the long term after vegetation and trees have matured. The simulations show a 15-year growth of landscaped vegetation and trees. It is important to note that these photographs assume a high species survival rate and implementation of proper maintenance techniques.

## 4.1.4.3 Issues Not Discussed Further

The proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista because the City of Santa Clara General Plan does not identify the project site or its surroundings as a scenic vista. Furthermore, the site would not block any public views of known scenic vistas. Given this, implementing the proposed project would have no impact to scenic vistas.

The project site is not located next to a scenic highway as designated by the State of California (Caltrans 2005). Kiely Boulevard is not designated as a scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

## 4.1.4.4 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact AES-1: Development of the project site would not visually degrade the visual character of the project area. (*Less than Significant*)**

The proposed project would alter the existing visual character of the project site by introducing new residential buildings and landscaping. The changes in visual character of the site show a difference in the landscaping and setbacks of the buildings on site. Visual impacts associated with the project would occur during demolition, grading, building construction, and project operation, as discussed below.

## *Construction*

Prior to construction, the existing buildings on the site would be demolished, the site would be graded and additional infrastructure would be installed to support the residential uses proposed for the site. Of the 597 existing trees on the site, approximately 487 trees would be removed during construction. During the construction of the residential units, graded lots would transition to framed structures, ranging from two- to four-story buildings, and then to finished buildings, with landscaped yards and surroundings. Visual impacts would vary, depending on the work and equipment being used at the site. In general, motorists using Kiely Boulevard, Kaiser Drive, and Pepper Tree Lane would continue to see some of the existing street trees presently located along the perimeter of the project site, construction equipment, piles of dirt, pipes, fencing, and structural materials.

The visual effects of construction activities are temporary, and would be similar in character to other similar types of development construction that typically occurs within the city limits and surrounding areas. Therefore, these activities would not represent a significant visual impact.

## *Project Completion and Occupancy*

Upon project completion, the long-term visual character of the project site would be established, including the final size and bulk of the structures, the architectural design, recreational amenities, and landscaping. The following provides a brief discussion of how the project would alter the existing views of the site and its surroundings, followed by a discussion of how the project would impact the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

**Viewpoint 1 - Facing Southwest from Central Park**

The project would change views of the site from Central Park, near the Kiely Boulevard and Kaiser Drive intersection from the green mature vegetation shielding most of the structure on the site to views of the proposed four-story multi-family housing units.

**Figures 4.1-6, View 1: Proposed Development** and **4.1-7, View 1: Proposed Development with Trees,** represent views of the project site looking southwest from Central Park to the project site with and without landscaping. As shown in the figures, the most prominent feature in this viewpoint is the four-story multi-family building (40 to 50 feet high from finished grade). The building would be set back 45 feet from Kiely Boulevard and 15 feet from the edge of Kaiser Drive (approximately 40 feet from the center of street). The 13-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path that would be located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site is visible in the midground of this simulation. The existing mature trees that would remain after project completion are shown in **Figure 4.1-6**. **Figure 4.1-7**, shows the trees associated with

the proposed landscaping plan. This figure shows a growth of 15 years for the trees planted as part of the landscaping.

**Viewpoint 2 - Facing Southeast from Pepper Tree Lane at Kaiser Drive**

As shown in **Figures 4.1-8, View 2: Proposed Development and 4.1-9, View 2: Proposed Development with Trees**, development of the project site would be visible in the foreground of this view. The proposed single-family town houses are shown at three stories in height (30 to 32 feet high from finished grade). As shown, the town houses would be set back approximately 15 feet from the edge of Kaiser Drive (approximately 25 feet from the center of the street). A landscaped median would be constructed as shown in the background of this view and would be planted with three trees. The single-family units would be visible along Kaiser Drive in the fore- and midground, as well as the multi-family unit building at the eastern end of Kaiser Drive. However, the both the single and multi-family units would be partially screened by the trees that would planted along Kaiser Drive, as shown in **Figure 4.1-9**.

**Viewpoint 3 – Facing north from Pepper Tree Lane at Marietta Drive**

The project would slightly change the views of the project site from Pepper Tree Lane near Marietta Drive. The visual changes, as shown in **Figures 4.1-10, View 3: Proposed Development** and **4.1-11, View 3: Proposed Development with Trees**, include partial visibility of a single-family town house on Pepper Tree Lane in the midground, and the rooftop of one of the proposed single-family homes in the foreground. Mature green vegetation is the prominent feature of this viewpoint. In the near term, there would not be a substantial change in the mature vegetation of this viewpoint. Once the proposed trees on Pepper Tree Lane mature, they would help further shield the single-family home visible in the midground of this viewpoint.

**Viewpoint 4 – Facing north on Kiely Boulevard from Central Park**

As shown in **Figure 4.1-12, View 4: Proposed Development and 4.1-13, View 4: Proposed Development with Trees**, development of the project site would be visible along Kiely Boulevard in the foreground, midground, and background of this view. The proposed town homes and multi-family unit buildings are partially visible in the near-term view behind some of the mature trees that would remain on the site screen the proposed structures. The buildings along Kiely Boulevard would be further shielded by the trees that would be planted as part of the project as shown in **Figure 4.1-13**.


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-6**

View 1: Proposed Development

966-001•05/08


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-7**

View 1: Proposed Development with Trees


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-8**

View 2: Proposed Development


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-9**

View 2: Proposed Development with Trees


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-10**

View 3: Proposed Development

966-001•05/08


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-11**

View 3: Proposed Development with Trees

966-001•05/08


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-12**

View 4: Proposed Development

966-001•05/08


**SOURCE:** Digital Imaging Studio - April 2008

FIGURE **4.1-13**

View 4: Proposed Development with Trees

966-001•05/08

## *Conclusion*

The proposed project would incorporate development standards and design guidelines to integrate the proposed land uses with the existing surrounding character of the area. The development standards are shown in Table A-3.0, Residential Development Standards, appended to this Draft EIR in **Appendix 3.0** and would provide standards for setbacks; building height; lot size, width, and depth; open space; lot coverage; parking; security; waste disposal; ancillary structures; and for community amenities, as described below.

The layout of the project would place the various types of housing units near similar types of density to the surrounding neighborhood. For example, the row houses would have a density of 24.3 units per acre and would be adjacent to the Woodborough Condominiums that have a density of 23.3 units per acre. Similarly, the town houses would have a density of 21.7 dwelling units per acre, which is compatible in size with the Alderwood Apartments located west of Pepper Tree Lane with a density of 24.8 units per acre. Lastly, the proposed 45 single-family homes near the southern edge of the project site adjacent to single-family residences. The square footage for the proposed houses on site would range from 1,500 square feet to 2,200 square feet. This would be compatible with the homes on Marietta Drive, which range from approximately 1,500 square feet to 2,000 square feet. See **Figure 4.1-11** for a comparison of the size and mass of the proposed single-family home to an existing home at the corner of Marietta Drive and Pepper Tree Lane. Please refer to **Section 4.7, Land Use and Planning**, for detailed description of land use compatibility.

The trees, both existing and proposed, would consist of varying height, and as shown in simulations, would help to screen views of the residential units from public view along the surrounding roadways, including Kiely Boulevard, Kaiser Drive, and Pepper Tree Lane.

Although the implementation of the proposed project would substantially change the visual character of the site from the hospital building and ancillary uses with large parking lots to residential development, the project would not have an adverse impact on visual resources during construction and upon occupancy because the site is surrounded by similar residential development and the proposed project is a continuation of surrounding uses. Consequently, the proposed project would not visually degrade the site. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.

**Mitigation Measure**: No mitigation measures required.

**Impact AES-2: Implementation of the project would introduce new sources of light and glare from residential land uses. (*Less than Significant with Mitigation*)**

The proposed project would create new sources of light and glare on the project site. This would be most visible from Pepper Tree Lane and Kaiser Drive, where the parking lot currently exists. The proposed residential units would include reflective surfaces, such as windows, that could create glare. Given the relative lack of lighting sources on the site, the project impact on lighting spillover and night-sky illumination would be potentially significant. However, there are many sources of existing light and glare in the area. The residential uses to the north, west, and south currently generate light and glare from streetlights, exterior home lighting, and impervious surfaces. Although this impact is considered less than significant, the following mitigation measures would further reduce impacts associated with light and glare.

**Mitigation Measure AES-2a:** The project developer shall install low-profile, low-intensity lighting directed downward to minimize light and glare.

**Mitigation Measure AES-2b:** High-intensity outdoor lighting on individual homes and structures shall be prohibited (this prohibition shall be included in the development Covenants Codes and Regulations (CC&R), with specific guidelines as to which lighting is appropriate).

**Mitigation Measure AES-2c:** The project developer shall use shielded fixtures for street lighting and park lighting to minimize glare produced by the lighting on the project site.

**Significance After Mitigation:** Implementation of the **Mitigation Measures AES-2a** through **AES-2c** would further reduce the magnitude of light and glare impacts, which are considered less than significant.

### 4.1.4.5 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The City of Santa Clara is predominately developed and the planned development occurring in the City near the project site is redevelopment of existing parcels. Therefore, the aesthetic impact of reasonable foreseeable projects, included in **Table 4.0-1, Related Projects**, would not substantially degrade the visual character of the City's urban setting since it would be just changing the visual appearance of those sites from one land use type to another. Additionally, it is not expected that future projects would cause significant impacts to light and glare given the existing contiguous light sources already present in the City and that the majority of the planned development would not develop on undeveloped open space lots. Therefore, cumulative impacts to visual resources is considered less than significant.

## 4.1.5 REFERENCES

California Department of Finance, E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001-2008, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, California, May 2008.

Caltrans. 2008. March 14. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/.